

OSS Evaluation Project Report – Test Results

Test Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
PMR4-3-N	Records in processed data used to calculate measures in Coordinated Conversions Measure Group are consistent with those in unprocessed data from source systems.	Satisfied	<p>Records in processed data used to calculate measures in the Coordinated Conversions Measure Group are consistent with those in unprocessed data from source systems.</p> <p>BearingPoint is using the benchmark that 95 percent of sample records in processed CLEC aggregate data are consistent with those in unprocessed data from source systems for each measure set evaluated in the measure group.</p> <p>One measure set has been evaluated:</p> <p>1. PM 114, PM 114.1, PM 115, PM 115.1, PM 115.2, PM MI 3</p> <p>See Table 4-22 for additional details.</p>
PMR4-4-N	Data fields in processed data used to calculate measures in the Coordinated Conversions Measure Group are consistent with those in unprocessed data from source systems.	Not Satisfied	<p>Data fields in processed data used to calculate measures in the Coordinated Conversions Measure Group are not consistent with those in unprocessed data from source systems.</p> <p>BearingPoint is using the benchmark that 95 percent of sample field values in processed data are consistent with unprocessed data in source systems for each measure set evaluated in the measure group.</p> <p>Two measure sets have been evaluated:</p> <p>1. PM 114, PM 114.1, PM 115 (Test CLEC)</p> <p>2. PM 114, PM 114.1, PM 115, PM 115.1, PM 115.2, PM MI 3 (CLEC Aggregate)</p> <p>BearingPoint issued Exception 175, Version 2 on January 10, 2003, which states that SBC Ameritech is using incorrect data in its calculation of PM 114 and PM 115 for the months of January 2002 through June 2002. For PM 114, SBC Ameritech indicated they would implement a process change to capture appropriate premature disconnect information so that they would be calculating this PM according to the business rules in May 2003.</p>

Test Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
			<p>For PM 115, SBC Ameritech indicated that they would propose a change to the business rules during the next six month review collaborative. Such that a CLEC Call time will be recorded as the "Start Time" of a cut, and the call to a CLEC to advise of a cut completion will be recorded as the "End Time" for the coordinated hot cut disaggregations for PM 115. Additionally, SBC Ameritech indicated that they would implement calculation changes to accurately reflect the proposed business rule changes in May 2003.</p> <p>Since SBC Ameritech requested that this Exception not be retested, BearingPoint issued a Disposition Report and proposed to close on June 24, 2003.</p> <p>See Table 4-23 for additional details.</p>

Table 4-16: PMR4 Evaluation Criteria and Results – NXX

Test Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
PMR4-1-O	Required source records are included in data used to calculate measures in the NXX Measure Group.	Not Applicable	<p>BearingPoint cannot determine whether required source records are included in data used to calculate measures in the NXX Measure Group.</p> <p>BearingPoint does not have its own records for the NXX Measure Group. Consequently, BearingPoint did not perform data integrity analysis for this measure group.</p> <p>See Table 4-20.</p>
PMR4-2-O	Inappropriate records are not present in processed data used to calculate measures in the NXX Measure Group.	Not Applicable	<p>BearingPoint cannot determine whether processed data used to calculate measures in the NXX Measure Group contain only appropriate records.</p> <p>BearingPoint does not have its own records for the NXX Measure Group. Consequently, BearingPoint did not perform data integrity analysis for this measure group.</p> <p>See Table 4-21.</p>

OSS Evaluation Project Report – Test Results

Test Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
PMR4-3-O	Records in processed data used to calculate measures in NXX Measure Group are consistent with those in unprocessed data from source systems.	Indeterminate	<p>BearingPoint is still analyzing whether records in processed data used to calculate measures in the NXX Measure Group are consistent with those in unprocessed data from source systems.</p> <p>BearingPoint used the benchmark that 95 percent of sample records in processed CLEC aggregate data are consistent with those in unprocessed data from source systems for each measure set evaluated in the measure group.</p> <p>One measure set has been evaluated and one measure set is still being evaluated:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PM 119 2. PM 117, PM 118 <p>See Table 4-22 for additional details.</p>

Test Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
PMR4-4-O	Data fields in processed data used to calculate measures in the NXX Measure Group are consistent with those in unprocessed data from source systems.	Indeterminate	<p>BearingPoint is still analyzing whether data fields in processed data used to calculate measures in the NXX Measure Group are consistent with those in unprocessed data from source systems.</p> <p>BearingPoint used the benchmark that 95 percent of sample field values in processed data are consistent with those in unprocessed data from source systems for each measure set evaluated in the measure group.</p> <p>BearingPoint does not have its own records for the NXX Measure Group. Consequently, BearingPoint did not perform an analysis using BearingPoint Test CLEC data for this measure group.</p> <p>One measure set has been evaluated and one measure set is still being evaluated:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. PM 119 (CLEC Aggregate)2. PM 117, PM 118 (CLEC Aggregate) <p>See Table 4-23 for additional details.</p>

Table 4-17: PMR4 Evaluation Criteria and Results – Bona Fide Requests

Test Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
PMR4-1-P	Required source records are included in data used to calculate measures in the Bona Fide Requests Measure Group.	Not Applicable	<p>BearingPoint cannot determine whether required source records are included in data used to calculate measures in the Bona Fide Requests Measure Group.</p> <p>BearingPoint does not have its own records for the Bona Fide Requests Measure Group. Consequently, BearingPoint did not perform data integrity analysis for this measure group.</p> <p>See Table 4-20.</p>
PMR4-2-P	Inappropriate records are not present in processed data used to calculate measures in the Bona Fide Requests Measure Group.	Not Applicable	<p>BearingPoint cannot determine whether inappropriate records are present in processed data used to calculate measures in the Bona Fide Requests Measure Group.</p> <p>BearingPoint does not have its own records for the Bona Fide Requests Measure Group. Consequently, BearingPoint did not perform data integrity analysis for this measure group.</p> <p>See Table 4-21.</p>

Test Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
PMR4-3-P	Records in processed data used to calculate measures in the Bona Fide Requests Measure Group are consistent with those in unprocessed data from source systems.	Satisfied	<p>Records in processed data used to calculate measures in the Bona Fide Requests Measure Group are consistent with those in unprocessed data from source systems.</p> <p>BearingPoint used the benchmark that 95 percent of sample records in processed CLEC aggregate data are consistent with those in unprocessed data from source systems for each measure set evaluated in the measure group.</p> <p>Two measure sets have been evaluated:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PM 120 2. PM 121 <p>See Table 4-22 for additional details.</p>
PMR4-4-P	Data fields in processed data used to calculate measures in the Bona Fide Requests Measure Group are consistent with those in unprocessed data from source systems.	Satisfied	<p>Data fields in processed data used to calculate measures in the Bona Fide Requests Measure Group are consistent with those in unprocessed data from source systems.</p> <p>BearingPoint used the benchmark that 95 percent of sample field values in processed data are consistent with those in unprocessed data from source systems for each measure set evaluated in the measure group.</p> <p>BearingPoint does not have its own records for the Bona Fide Requests Measure Group. Consequently, BearingPoint did not perform an analysis using BearingPoint Test CLEC data for this measure group.</p> <p>Two measure sets have been evaluated:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PM 120 (CLEC Aggregate) 2. PM 121 (CLEC Aggregate) <p>See Table 4-23 for additional details.</p>

Table 4-18: PMR4 Evaluation Criteria and Results – Facilities Modification

Test Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
PMR4-1-Q	Required source records are included in data used to calculate measures in the Facilities Modification Measure Group.	Not Applicable	<p>BearingPoint cannot determine whether required source records are included in data used to calculate measures in the Facilities Modification Measure Group.</p> <p>BearingPoint does not have its own records for the Facilities Modification Measure Group. Consequently, BearingPoint did not perform data integrity analysis for this measure group.</p> <p>See Table 4-20.</p>
PMR4-2-Q	Inappropriate records are not present in processed data used to calculate measures in the Facilities Modification Measure Group.	Not Applicable	<p>BearingPoint cannot determine whether inappropriate records are present in processed data used to calculate measures in the Facilities Modification Measure Group.</p> <p>BearingPoint does not have its own records for the Facilities Modification Measure Group. Consequently, BearingPoint did not perform data integrity analysis for this measure group.</p> <p>See Table 4-21.</p>

Test Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
PMR4-3-Q	Records in processed data used to calculate measures in the Facilities Modification Measure Group are consistent with those in unprocessed data from source systems.	Indeterminate	<p>BearingPoint is still analyzing whether records in processed data used to calculate measures in the Facilities Modification Measure Group are consistent with those in unprocessed data from source systems.</p> <p>BearingPoint is using the benchmark that 95 percent of sample records in processed CLEC aggregate data are consistent with those in unprocessed data from source systems for each measure set evaluated in the measure group.</p> <p>A measure set consisting of records/values for PM CW 1, PM CW 6, PM CW 7, PM CW 8, and PM CW 9 is still being evaluated.</p> <p>A second measure set was to be evaluated using a sample of CLEC aggregate records related to PM CW 11 and PM WI 9. It was later determined that SBC Ameritech uses unprocessed data to calculate some parts of these measures. Therefore, data integrity analysis of the unprocessed data was not performed. Additionally, the processed data and calculation logic used to calculate the remaining parts of these measures are the same as the processed data and calculation logic for PM 58. Therefore, the analysis of this data for PM 58 also applies to PM CW 11 and PM WI 9.</p> <p>See Table 4-22 for additional details.</p>

Test Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
PMR4-4-Q	Data fields in processed data used to calculate measures in the Facilities Modification Measure Group are consistent with those in unprocessed data from source systems.	Indeterminate	<p>BearingPoint is still analyzing whether the data fields in processed data used to calculate measures in the Facilities Modification Measure Group are consistent with those in unprocessed data from source systems.</p> <p>BearingPoint is using the benchmark that 95 percent of sample field values in processed data are consistent with those in unprocessed data from source systems for each measure set evaluated in the measure group.</p> <p>BearingPoint does not have its own records for the Facilities Modification Measure Group. Consequently, BearingPoint did not perform an analysis using BearingPoint Test CLEC data for this measure group.</p> <p>A measure set consisting of CLEC aggregate records/values for PM CW 1, PM CW 6, PM CW 7, PM CW 8, and PM CW 9 is still being evaluated.</p> <p>A second measure set was to be evaluated using a sample of CLEC aggregate records related to PM CW 11 and PM WI 9. It was later determined that SBC Ameritech uses unprocessed data to calculate portions of these measures. Therefore, data integrity analysis of the unprocessed data was not performed. Additionally, the processed data and calculation logic used to calculate the remaining portions of these measures are the same as the processed data and calculation logic for PM 58. Therefore, the analysis of this data for PM 58 also applies to PM CW 11 and PM WI 9.</p> <p>See Table 4-23 for additional details.</p>

Table 4-19: PMR4 Evaluation Criteria and Results – Other

Test Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
PMR4-1-R	Required source records are included in data used to calculate measures in the Other Measure Group.	Indeterminate	<p>BearingPoint is still analyzing whether required source records are included in data used to calculate measures in the Other Measure Group.</p> <p>BearingPoint is using the benchmark that 95 percent of required source records are included for each measure set evaluated in the measure group.</p> <p>One measure set is still being evaluated and one measure set has been retested:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PM MI 11 2. PM MI 13 <p>See Table 4-20 for additional details.</p>
PMR4-2-R	Inappropriate records are not present in processed data used to calculate measures in the Other Measure Group.	Indeterminate	<p>BearingPoint is still analyzing whether inappropriate records are present in processed data used to calculate measures in the Other Measure Group.</p> <p>BearingPoint is using the benchmark that no more than 5 percent of processed records do not correspond to actual BearingPoint Test CLEC transaction records for each measure set evaluated in the measure group.</p> <p>A measure set consisting of records/values for PM MI 13 is still being evaluated.</p> <p>A second measure set was to be evaluated using BearingPoint Test CLEC transaction records related to PM MI 11. It was later determined that the data for this PM cannot be evaluated using the technique devised for this evaluation criterion.</p> <p>See Table 4-21 for additional details.</p>
PMR4-3-R	Records in processed data used to calculate measures in the Other Measure Group are	Indeterminate	<p>BearingPoint is still analyzing whether records in processed data used to calculate measures in the Other Measure Group are consistent with those in unprocessed data from source systems.</p>

Test Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
	consistent with those in unprocessed data from source systems.		<p>unprocessed data from source systems.</p> <p>BearingPoint is using the benchmark that 95 percent of sample records in processed CLEC aggregate data are consistent with those in unprocessed data from source systems for each measure set evaluated in the measure group.</p> <p>Three measure sets have been evaluated, five measure sets are still being evaluated:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PM CW 4 2. PM CW 5 3. PM IN 1 4. PM MI 9 5. PM MI 11 6. PM MI 13 7. PM MI 14 8. PM WI 1, PM WI 2 <p>A ninth measure set was to be evaluated using a sample of CLEC aggregate records related to PM MI 12 and PM MI 15. It was later determined that SBC Ameritech uses unprocessed data to calculate measures in this measure set for the CLEC aggregate. Consequently, BearingPoint did not perform data integrity analysis for this measure set.</p> <p>BearingPoint issued Observation 842 on April 24, 2003, stating that SBC Ameritech appears to be capturing duplicate records of individual transactions in "Install_Hicap_Subrate_Detail" and "Pots_Install tables" for the July 2002 data month in Regulatory Reporting System (RRS) and may be "double counting" these records in two other performance measurements (PM CW 5, and PM WI 1). SBC Ameritech issued a response on June 2, 2003. BearingPoint issued additional questions on June 20, 2003.</p> <p>BearingPoint issued Analysis Report 5 on May 30, 2003, which states that BearingPoint is unable to match unprocessed data stored in SBC Ameritech's source systems to the corresponding processed data used in the calculation of</p>

Test Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
			<p>PM MI 9. BearingPoint received SBC Ameritech's response to Analysis Report 5 on June 20, 2003. BearingPoint is reviewing the response.</p> <p>As of June 10, 2003, one measure data request has not been fulfilled. This impacts PM MI 14.</p> <p>See Table 4-22 for additional details.</p>
PMR4-4-R	Data fields in processed data used to calculate measures in the Other Measure Group are consistent with those in unprocessed data from source systems.	Indeterminate	<p>BearingPoint is still analyzing whether data fields in processed data used to calculate measures in the Other Measure Group are not consistent with those in unprocessed data from source systems.</p> <p>BearingPoint is using the benchmark that 95 percent of sample field values in processed data are consistent with those in unprocessed data from source systems for each measure set evaluated in the measure group.</p> <p>Three measure sets have been evaluated, six measure sets are still being evaluated:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PM MI 13 (Test CLEC) 2. PM CW 4 (CLEC Aggregate) 3. PM CW 5 (CLEC Aggregate) 4. PM IN 1 (CLEC Aggregate) 5. PM MI 9 (CLEC Aggregate) 6. PM MI 11 (CLEC Aggregate) 7. PM MI 13 (CLEC Aggregate) 8. PM MI 14 (CLEC Aggregate) 9. PM WI 1, PM WI 2 (CLEC Aggregate) <p>A tenth measure set was to be evaluated using BearingPoint Test CLEC transaction records related to PM MI 11. It was later determined that the data for this PM cannot be evaluated using the technique devised for this evaluation criterion.</p> <p>An eleventh measure set was to be evaluated to evaluated using a sample of CLEC aggregate records related to PM MI 12 and PM MI 15. It was later</p>

Test Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
			<p>determined that SBC Ameritech uses unprocessed data to calculate measures in this measure set for the CLEC aggregate. Consequently, BearingPoint did not perform data integrity analysis for this measure set.</p> <p>On April 16, 2003, BearingPoint issued Exception 134, Version 2, which states that SBC Ameritech incorrectly populated the product name field in the Regulatory Reporting System (RRS). The product name is populated as "UNKNOWN" for up to 29,662 records in the January 2002 RRS "install_hicap_subrate_detail" table. This table supports the reporting of PM WI 1. BearingPoint issued a Disposition Report for Exception 134, Version 2 on June 30, 2003 indicating that this issue had been addressed.</p> <p>BearingPoint issued Observation 842 on April 24, 2003, stating that SBC Ameritech appears to be capturing duplicate records of individual transactions in "Install_Hicap_Subrate_Detail" and "Pots_Install tables" for the July 2002 data month in Regulatory Reporting System (RRS) and may be "double counting" these records in two other performance measurements (PM CW 5, and PM WI 1). SBC Ameritech issued a response on June 2, 2003. BearingPoint issued additional questions on June 20, 2003.</p> <p>BearingPoint issued Analysis Report 5 on May 30, 2003, which states that BearingPoint is unable to match unprocessed data stored in SBC Ameritech's source systems to the corresponding processed data used in the calculation of PM MI 9. BearingPoint received SBC Ameritech's response to Analysis Report 5 on June 20, 2003. BearingPoint is reviewing the response.</p> <p>As of June 10, 2003, one measure data request has not been fulfilled. This impacts the following measure: PM MI 14.</p> <p>See Table 4-23 for additional details.</p>

4.2 Additional Data

Table 4-20: PMR4-1 – Additional Information for Required Source Records Included in Metrics Data

Measure Group	Performance Measures (Measure Set)	Data Type	Data Month (CY2002)	Values Sampled	Values Validated	Values in Error	Score
Pre-Ordering	2	Test CLEC	Jan – May	6,299	6,115	184	97.1%
Ordering	5, 6, 7.1, 8, 10.1, 10.2, 10.3, 10.4, 11, 11.1, 11.2, MI 2	Test CLEC and CLEC	Apr – Jul	6,223	5,218	26	≤99.6%
	5.2	Test CLEC and CLEC	Apr – Nov	894	302	130	≤85.5%
Provisioning	58	CLEC	Jan – Mar	1,035	1,028	7	99.3%
	59	CLEC	Jan – Mar	1,051	1,051	0	100%
	27, 28, 29, 32, 33, 43, 44, 45, 49, 50, 55, 55.1, 55.2, 56, 56.1	Test CLEC and CLEC	Apr – Jul	2,422	tbd	tbd	tbd
Maintenance and Repair	38, 39, 40, 52, 66, 67, 68	Test CLEC	Jan – May	1,249	1,247	2	99.8%
Billing	16	Test CLEC	Mar – May	3	3	0	100%
	19 (Other)	Test CLEC	Mar – May	6,791	6,791	0	100%
	19 (Category 11) ²	Test CLEC	Feb	-- ³	-- ⁴	0	100%
Miscellaneous Administrative	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Interconnection Trunks	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Directory	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

² Due to the sensitive nature of this information, the actual number of volunteer CLEC Category 11 records tested have been included in the report.

³ Refer to footnote 2.

⁴ Refer to footnote 2.

Measure Group	Performance Measures (Measure Set)	Data Type	Data Month (CY2002)	Values Sampled	Values Validated	Values in Error	Score
Assistance/Operator Services							
Local Number Portability	96	CLEC	Feb – Jun	587	389	198	≥66.3%
	97	CLEC	Jan – Jun	587	389	198	≥66.3%
	98	CLEC	Jan – Jun	860	851	9	99.0%
911	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Poles, Conduits, and Rights-of-Way	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Collocation	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Directory Assistance Database	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Coordinated Conversions	114, 114.1, 115	CLEC	Jan – Jun	844	828	16	98.1%
NXX	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Bona Fide Requests	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Facilities Modification	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Other	MI 11	Test CLEC	Jan – Apr	21	21	0	100%
	MI 13	Test CLEC	Mar – Oct	860	253	5	≤99.4%

Table 4-21: PMR4-2 – Additional Information for Appropriateness of Records in Processed Data

Measure Group	Performance Measures (Measure Set)	Data Type	Data Month (CY2002)	Values Sampled	Values Validated	Values in Error	Score
Pre-Ordering	2	Test CLEC	Jan – May	6,299	6,299	0	100%
Ordering	5, 6, 7.1, 8, 10.1, 10.2, 10.3, 10.4, 11, 11.1, 11.2, MI 2	Test CLEC and CLEC	Apr – Jul	6,223	tbd	tbd	tbd
	5.2	Test CLEC and CLEC	Apr – Nov	894	tbd	tbd	tbd
Provisioning	27, 28, 29, 32, 33, 43, 44, 45, 49, 50, 55, 55.1, 55.2, 56, 56.1, 58	Test CLEC and CLEC	Apr – Jul	2,502	tbd	tbd	tbd
Maintenance and Repair	38, 39, 40, 52, 66, 67, 68	Test CLEC	Jan – May	1,249	1,249	0	100%
Billing	16	Test CLEC	Mar – May	3	3	0	100%
	17	Test CLEC	Feb, May, and Jun	tbd	tbd	tbd	tbd
Miscellaneous Administrative	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Interconnection Trunks	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Directory Assistance/ Operator Services	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Local Number Portability	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
911	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Poles, Conduits, and Rights-of-Way	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Collocation	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Measure Group	Performance Measures (Measure Set)	Data Type	Data Month (CY2002)	Values Sampled	Values Validated	Values in Error	Score
Directory Assistance Database	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Coordinated Conversions	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
NXX	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Bona Fide Requests	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Facilities Modification	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Other	MI 13	Test CLEC	Mar – Oct	860	tbd	tbd	tbd

Table 4-22: PMR4-3 – Additional Information for Consistency of Records Between Processed and Unprocessed Data

Measure Group	Performance Measures (Measure Set)	Data Type	Data Month (CY2002)	Values Sampled	Values Validated	Values in Error	Score ⁵
Pre-Ordering	1.1	CLEC Aggregate	Jan	143	143	0	100%
	2, MI 10, MI 16	CLEC Aggregate	Jan	3,874	2,673	0	≤100%
Ordering	10, 11	CLEC Aggregate	Jan	278	tbd	tbd	tbd
	9, 10.1, 10.2, 10.3, 11.1, 11.2	CLEC Aggregate	Jan	280	tbd	tbd	tbd
	10.4, MI 2	CLEC Aggregate	Jan	307	tbd	tbd	tbd
	13, 13.1	CLEC Aggregate	Jan	265	tbd	tbd	tbd
	7, 8	CLEC Aggregate	Jan	883	tbd	tbd	tbd
	7.1	CLEC Aggregate	Jan	229	tbd	tbd	tbd
	5, 6	CLEC Aggregate	Jan	189	tbd	tbd	tbd
	5.2	CLEC Aggregate	Jan	294	tbd	tbd	tbd
Provisioning	12 (ACIS data)	CLEC Aggregate	Jul	269	tbd	tbd	tbd
	12 (CABS data)	CLEC Aggregate	Jul	503	tbd	tbd	tbd
	27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33	CLEC Aggregate	Jan	454	tbd	tbd	tbd
	43, 44, 45, 47, 48, 49, 50	CLEC Aggregate	Jul	609	tbd	tbd	tbd
	55, 55.1, 55.2,	CLEC	Jul	579	tbd	tbd	tbd

⁵ Score is weighted once analysis has been completed.

Measure Group	Performance Measures (Measure Set)	Data Type	Data Month (CY2002)	Values Sampled	Values Validated	Values in Error	Score ⁵
	55.3, 56, 56.1, 58, 60, 61, 62, 63	Aggregate					
	35, 46, 59	CLEC Aggregate	Jul	1,106	tbd	tbd	tbd
Maintenance and Repair	38, 39, 40, 41, 42	CLEC Aggregate	Jan	366	tbd	tbd	tbd
	52, 53, 54	CLEC Aggregate	Jul	751	tbd	tbd	tbd
	66, 67, 68, 69	CLEC Aggregate	Jul	649	tbd	tbd	tbd
	37, 37.1, 54.1, 65, 65.1	CLEC Aggregate	Jul	1,828	tbd	tbd	tbd
Billing	14	CLEC Aggregate	Jul	365	tbd	tbd	tbd
	17 (ACIS data)	CLEC Aggregate	Jul	269	tbd	tbd	tbd
	18	CLEC Aggregate	Dec	143	tbd	tbd	tbd
	19	CLEC Aggregate	Jan	91,795,790	91,736,437	59,353	100.0%
Miscellaneous Administrative	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Interconnection Trunks	73, 74, 75, 76, 78	CLEC Aggregate	Jul	397	tbd	tbd	tbd
Directory Assistance/Operator Services	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Local Number Portability	93	CLEC Aggregate	Jan	210	tbd	tbd	tbd
	95	CLEC Aggregate	Jan	280	tbd	tbd	tbd
	92, 96, 97, 98,	CLEC	Jul	599	tbd	tbd	tbd

Measure Group	Performance Measures (Measure Set)	Data Type	Data Month (CY2002)	Values Sampled	Values Validated	Values in Error	Score ⁵
	99, 100, 101	Aggregate					
	91	CLEC Aggregate	Sep	315	tbd	tbd	tbd
911	104.1	CLEC Aggregate	Feb 2003	707	tbd	tbd	tbd
	MI 6	CLEC Aggregate	Jan	140	140	0	100%
Poles, Conduits, and Rights-of-Way	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Collocation	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Directory Assistance Database	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Coordinated Conversions	114, 114.1, 115, 115.1, 115.2, MI 3	CLEC Aggregate	Dec	821	818	3	99.6%
NXX	117, 118	CLEC Aggregate	Feb 2003	104	tbd	tbd	tbd
	119	CLEC Aggregate	Jan	173	173	0	100%
Bona Fide Requests	120	CLEC Aggregate	Dec	3	3	0	100%
	121	CLEC Aggregate	Dec	1	1	0	100%
Facilities Modification	CW 1, CW 6, CW 7, CW 8, CW 9	CLEC Aggregate	Dec	223	tbd	tbd	tbd
	CW 11, WI 9	CLEC Aggregate	Jul	579	tbd	tbd	tbd
Other	MI 11	CLEC Aggregate	Dec	18	18	0	100%
	IN 1	CLEC Aggregate	Jan	121	121	0	100%

Measure Group	Performance Measures (Measure Set)	Data Type	Data Month (CY2002)	Values Sampled	Values Validated	Values in Error	Score ⁵
	MI 13	CLEC Aggregate	Jan	1,322	tbd	tbd	tbd
	WI 1, WI 2	CLEC Aggregate	Jul	461	tbd	tbd	tbd
	MI 14	CLEC Aggregate	Dec	240	tbd	tbd	tbd
	MI 9	CLEC Aggregate	Jan	158	tbd	tbd	tbd
	CW 5	CLEC Aggregate	Jan	350	tbd	tbd	tbd
	CW 4	CLEC Aggregate	Aug	1	1	0	100%

Table 4-23: PMR4-4 – Additional Information for Consistency of Data Fields Between Processed and Unprocessed Data

Measure Group	Performance Measures (Measure Set)	Data Type	Data Month (CY2002)	Values Sampled	Values Validated	Values in Error	Score
Pre-Ordering	2	Test CLEC	Jan – May	56,691	55,028	1,663	97.1%
	1.1	CLEC Aggregate	Jan	1,573	1,573	0	100%
	2, MI 10, MI 16	CLEC Aggregate	Jan	41,152	26,740	0	≤100%
Ordering	5, 6, 7.1, 8, 10.1, 10.2, 10.3, 10.4, 11, 11.1, 11.2, MI 2	Test CLEC and CLEC	Apr – Jul	74,676	13,176	1,230	≤98.4%
	5.2	Test CLEC and CLEC	Apr – Nov	8,046	2,114	1,170	≤85.5%
	10, 11	CLEC Aggregate	Jan	7,506	tbd	tbd	tbd
	9, 10.1, 10.2, 10.3, 11.1, 11.2	CLEC Aggregate	Jan	1,396	tbd	166	≤88.1%
	10.4, MI 2	CLEC Aggregate	Jan	2,436	tbd	629	≤74.2%
	13, 13.1	CLEC Aggregate	Jan	795	tbd	100	≤87.4%
	7, 8	CLEC Aggregate	Jan	2,448	tbd	648	≤73.5%
	7.1	CLEC Aggregate	Jan	881	tbd	197	≤77.6%
	5, 6	CLEC Aggregate	Jan	927	tbd	89	≤90.4%
	5.2	CLEC Aggregate	Jan	1,080	tbd	302	≤72.0%
Provisioning	58	CLEC	Jan – Mar	5,175	5,059	116	97.8%
	59	CLEC	Jan – Mar	4,204	4,197	7	99.8%

Measure Group	Performance Measures (Measure Set)	Data Type	Data Month (CY2002)	Values Sampled	Values Validated	Values in Error	Score
	27, 28, 29, 32, 33, 43, 44, 45, 49, 50, 55, 55.1, 55.2, 56, 56.1	Test CLEC and CLEC	Apr – Jul	92,036	tbd	tbd	tbd
	12 (ACIS data)	CLEC Aggregate	Jul	1,883	tbd	tbd	tbd
	12 (CABS data)	CLEC Aggregate	Jul	14, 084	tbd	tbd	tbd
	27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33	CLEC Aggregate	Jan	7,264	tbd	tbd	tbd
	43, 44, 45, 47, 48, 49, 50	CLEC Aggregate	Jul	12,381	tbd	tbd	tbd
	55, 55.1, 55.2, 55.3, 56, 56.1, 58, 60, 61, 62, 63	CLEC Aggregate	Jul	16,293	tbd	tbd	tbd
	35, 46, 59	CLEC Aggregate	Jul	18,522	tbd	tbd	tbd
Maintenance and Repair	38, 39, 40, 52, 66, 67, 68	Test CLEC	Jan – May	19,865	18,516	439	≤97.8%
	38, 39, 40, 41, 42	CLEC Aggregate	Jan	11,346	tbd	tbd	tbd
	52, 53, 54	CLEC Aggregate	Jul	15,080	tbd	tbd	tbd
	66, 67, 68, 69	CLEC Aggregate	Jul	15,166	tbd	tbd	tbd
	37, 37.1, 54.1, 65, 65.1	CLEC Aggregate	Jul	31,599	tbd	tbd	tbd
Billing	19 (Other)	Test CLEC	Mar – May	27,164	27,164	0	100%

Measure Group	Performance Measures (Measure Set)	Data Type	Data Month (CY2002)	Values Sampled	Values Validated	Values in Error	Score
	19 (Category 11) ⁶	Test CLEC	Feb	-- ⁷	-- ⁸	0	100%
	14	CLEC Aggregate	Jul	3,401	tbd	tbd	tbd
	17 (ACIS data)	CLEC Aggregate	July	1,883	tbd	tbd	tbd
	18	CLEC Aggregate	Dec	858	tbd	tbd	tbd
Miscellaneous Administrative	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Interconnection Trunks	73, 74, 75, 76, 78	CLEC Aggregate	Jul	7,313	tbd	tbd	tbd
Directory Assistance/Operator Services	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Local Number Portability	96	CLEC	Feb – Jun	7,044	4,475	2,563	≥63.6%
	97	CLEC	Jan – Jun	7,044	4,469	2,376	≥66.3%
	98	CLEC	Jan – Jun	9,460	9,111	143	≤98.5%
	93	CLEC Aggregate	Jan	2,730	tbd	tbd	tbd
	95	CLEC Aggregate	Jan	1,396	tbd	166	≤88.1%
	92, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101	CLEC Aggregate	Jul	10,395	tbd	tbd	tbd
	91	CLEC Aggregate	Sep	4,712	tbd	tbd	tbd
911	104.1	CLEC Aggregate	Feb 2003	3,505	tbd	tbd	tbd
	MI 6	CLEC	Jan	700	700	0	100%

⁶ Refer to footnote 2.⁷ Refer to footnote 2.⁸ Refer to footnote 2.